

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the instant amendment, Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 19 have been amended to more particularly point out Applicant's invention. Claim 1 has additionally been amended to overcome the objection described at paragraph 2 of the Official Action; claim 13 has additionally been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claim 1 was objected to because of use of "TDM". The claim has been amended to recite "time division multiplexing." As such, the basis for the objection is obviated.

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulman, U.S. Patent No. 5,915,008 ("Dulman"), in view of Gutpa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,555,244 ("Gupta") or Allen, Jr., et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,169,735 ("Allen"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Dulman, Gupta or Allen, either singly or in combination.

Dulman is relied on for allegedly teaching, "a broader, general overview of the aspects of the claimed invention." Gupta and Allen are relied on merely for allegedly teaching TDM in an AIN network.

As discussed in the Specification, an aspect of the present invention relates to intercepting supplementary service requests, such as redirection, etc., and determining an alternate and/or optimal routing solution therefor, even if the ultimate performing server is not in the original communication path. To this end, one or more servers in a communication path are provided with trunk and line side NRCRs (i.e., in general, they may be provided at each of the server's communication interfaces) to provide a redirection solution in accordance with embodiments of the present invention.

Thus, claim 1 has been amended to recite a "network services control system (NRCR) connected to each external interface of said plurality of servers" and "wherein an NRCR at at least one of said plurality of servers in a communication path of said supplementary service communications request is adapted to intercept a

supplementary communications service request to determine whether execution of said supplementary communications service request is carried out by a server other than an original requested server, perform a link optimization based on a type of supplementary service being requested and redirect said supplementary service communications request to said other server over the TDM communications network;" claim 5 has been amended to recite "a network services control system (NRCR) connected to each external interface of said plurality of servers to receive and decode supplementary service information for the supplementary communications services being requested" and "wherein at least one of said plurality of servers in a communication path of a supplementary communications service request comprises an intervening server and is adapted to intercept a supplementary communications service request..." and claim 9 has been amended to recite "said intervening server including a network services control system (NRCR) at each communication interface; receiving and decoding supplementary service information for said supplementary communications service being requested at an intercepting NRCR; performing a link optimization at said intercepting NRCR..."

In contrast, as discussed in response to previous Official Actions, Dulman relates to a system for "provisioning" an AIN from customer premises equipment (CPE). A CPE is able to send a "service request" to the AIN. In particular, "[the Dulman] invention. . .provides an arrangement. . .enabling subscribers to use customer premises equipment (CPE) to download a service request comprising transaction data in order to activate or modify AIN services." Col. 4, lines 45-49. While Dulman makes use of superficially similar "service request" terminology, it is readily apparent that a "service request" in Dulman relates to authorization of provisioning of services rather than implementation thereof.

In addition, however, Dulman describes a prior art method of implementing supplementary services such as call redirection. However, in contrast to the present invention, these services are based on accessing an external, remote and central ISCP

22 to which all requests are forwarded, rather than an NRCR interceptor that may be coupled to each server interface in a communication path, as generally recited in the claims at issue. That is, the present invention allows any server in the network to intercept and itself perform a determination of redirection and/or optimization of the supplementary service request. In Dulman, only the central ISCP – outside of any communications path -- is capable of making such determination. The present invention thus provides, inter alia, advantages in flexibility, etc., over the centralized, outside Dulman system.

Gupta and Allen are relied on merely for allegedly teaching TDM in an AIN network. However, neither remedy the deficiencies discussed above with reference to Dulman. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 13-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulman in view of Gupta or Allen and further in view of Lin et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,999,610 ("Lin"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Dulman, Gupta or Allen or Lin, either singly or in combination. Claim 13 has been amended to recite "said network services control system being in a path of a supplementary service function being requested." Dulman, Gupta, Allen have been discussed above. Lin is relied on for allegedly teaching lists of servers' addresses. However, like Dulman, Gupta and Allen, Lin does not appear to relate, inter alia, to "intercept[ing] and redirect[ing] supplementary service functions for handling to another server," or "said network services control system being in a path of a supplementary service function being requested," as generally recited in the claims at issue. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 13-19.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 09/086,294

Attorney Docket No. 98P7528US03

Respectfully requested,

*Francis Montgomery*

Francis G. Montgomery

Reg. No. 41,202

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
(732) 321-3130